

REMARKS

At the outset, the Examiner is thanked for the thorough review and consideration of the pending application. The Non-Final Office Action dated April 4, 2011, has been received and its contents carefully reviewed.

Claims 12, 18, and 19 are rejected to by the Examiner. With this response, claim 12 has been amended. No new matter has been added. Thus, claims 12, 18, and 19 remain pending in this application.

In the Office Action, claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,403,616 to Hattori et al. (hereinafter “Hattori”) in combination with Japanese Patent Publication No. 08-031830 (hereinafter “830”) alone or further in combination with U.S. Patent No. 6,730,358 to Yamuni et al. (hereinafter “Yamuni) both or in combination with U.S. Patent No. 4,704,002 to Kikuchi et al. (hereinafter Kikuchi) and U.S. Patent No. 6,230,619 to Yamazaki et al. (hereinafter Yamazaki); and claims 18 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hattori in combination with 830 alone or further in combination with Kikuchi further in combination with Yamazaki and U.S. Patent No. 4,301,191 to Peek (hereinafter Peek).

The rejections of claims 12, 18, and 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) are respectfully traversed, and reconsideration is requested.

Claim 12 is allowable at least in that this claim recites a combination of elements, including, for example, “the resist pattern is contacted with the upper surface of the etching layer.” None of the cited references, singly or in combination, teaches or suggests at least these features of the claimed invention.

As shown in Figs. 1A-1E of Hattori, the transparent conductive material is directly formed on the substrate, not on the etching layer. Further, as shown in Fig. 12B of Yamazaki, the paste is directly coated on the board using a roller, not on the etching layer.

On the contrary, in the claimed invention the resist is directly deposited on the etching layer, not the substrate, so that the resist pattern is contacted with the upper surface of the etching layer.

Thus, the cited references fail to teach or suggest at least “the resist pattern is contacted with the upper surface of the etching layer.”

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 12 and claims 18 and 19, which depend from claim 12, are allowable over the cited references.

Applicants believe the application is in condition for allowance and early, favorable action is respectfully solicited.

If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at (202) 496-7500 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance. All correspondence should continue to be sent to the below-listed address.

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. §1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.

Dated: July 5, 2011

Respectfully submitted,

/Valerie P. Hayes/
Valerie P. Hayes
Registration No.: 53,005
McKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP
1900 K Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20006
(202) 496-7500
Attorneys for Applicant